

S E C R E T

18 June 55

To: [redacted] 25X1A9A

Re: CFEP Study #16, Enforcement

1. I went to MDAC Friday afternoon (vesterday) and read as much of the redraft of #16 as was available. [redacted]

2. [redacted] working on the first two parts (Parts I, II) which are principally a factual summary of the various control measures. I looked over what he was doing, and found it to be, generally, an improvement, though not really first class. However, these sections are by nature preliminary and of less importance than the latter two sections [redacted]

3. I suggest the following further action:

25X1A9A

(a) Re Parts I and II (p. 1-10 in present draft) - I have asked [redacted] to sent [redacted] to MDAC first thing Monday AM, 20 June to go over [redacted] She should only raise questions or objections to serious inaccuracies or omissions, and should not nit-pick the report [redacted]

(b) Re the Analysis portion. The redraft is attached. Read it over bearing in mind the discussion of the drafting group, and decide whether it is adequate. Without having the benefit of the drafting group discussion, my opinion is that this portion is at least adequate and probably the ~~xx~~ best obtainable. [redacted] organization is improved. As this part now stands, I have no serious objection. I have relatively less important thoughts: e.g., I'm sorry he deleted the last paragraph of sub-topic (7); also I think that the paper is deficient without a summary statement as to whether or not the enforcement effort has been worthwhile to date (see my draft, p. -f-, middle of page; also I think that the thought in the 2nd and 3rd lines of my draft, p. -g- might have been retained.

(c) Re the Conclusions. I think these are pretty feeble. What did the drafting group say, and does this reflect ~~xxx~~ their view? I don't disagree with what was said, but I don't think it gives very strong and clear guidance.

(continued)

DOC Waiver Letter In ERU File

S E C R E T

The paper is deficient, in my opinion, in failing to comment as to the possibilities or difficulties of enforcement under changed assumptions as to levels or types of controls. We know that there is a direct relationship between enforceability and the system which is to be enforced, and we saw the sad results of this in 1954 review where this point was never considered. The paper, I think, should indicate whether or not the enforcement problem would be changed, made easier or harder by, e.g., a reduction of CHINCOM controls part way or all the way to the European level; and also the enforceability of U.S. controls, should they remain unchanged while multilateral controls are altered.

25X1

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

25X1A9A 4. In summary, I think that the review of the conclusions is probably something for [REDACTED] to give guidance on, as qualified by your impressions from the drafting session.

25X1

5. I was not able to talk [REDACTED] on this draft, since he left immediately on completing his part of it for a week's vacation.

[REDACTED]
would immediately be stencilled and distributed as completed. Hence, if we wish to comment further, it's up to us to do so early Monday.

[REDACTED]

2

2

Next 19 Page(s) In Document Exempt